



4200.Draft
DTCG23-01-R-AGLMSA
16 June 2000

To All Prospective Offerors:

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Coast Guard intends to procure a multi-mission Great Lakes Ice Breaker (GLIB) to replace the aging USCGC MACKINAW with a ship capable of performing both the present heavy icebreaker mission and servicing short range aids-to-navigation (ATON). The Coast Guard is seeking industry comments on elements of the draft solicitation prior to releasing the Request For Proposal (RFP). Draft solicitation documents will be available on the GLIB web-site <http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-a/glib/> commencing 16 June 2000. Elements of the draft solicitation will not be released all at once, but documents will be "rolled out" sequentially and posted as they become fully developed. This is to provide industry access earlier than would have otherwise been feasible in an electronic format. Additional information outlining when all documents are expected to be posted will be provided on the web site.

The procurement is for one ship. The prime contractor will be required to design and build the ship as well as provide maintenance services beyond ship's force capability for the first two years after delivery. Reliability, maintainability and availability are prime concerns to meet all operational performance requirement parameters. The Coast Guard seeks an integrated logistics support approach to operate the vessel with no increase in present Coast Guard infrastructure for such elements as training, maintenance, and supply support.

PRE-SOLICITATION CONFERENCE

The Coast Guard will conduct a pre-solicitation conference on 1 August 2000 at 8:00 AM at Coast Guard Headquarters in Washington, DC. Additional details will be provided on the GLIB web-site approximately two weeks before the conference.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The following companies participated in developing the Coast Guard's concept exploration design. They are currently precluded from any participation in either the design or construction efforts. If an exemption to this exclusion is desired, contact the contracting officer at the Coast Guard Engineering Logistics Center, Mr. Dave Monk, at 410-762-6456.

Listing of companies:

M. Rosenblatt & Sons
Science Technology Corp. (STC)
Spectrum Associates
Kvaerner Masa-Yards Arctic Research Center (MARC)- Finland (Performed Model Tests)
Lehtonen & Siirila Oy - Finland
Fleet Technology - Canada
BRTRC

MEETINGS WITH THE PROJECT MANAGER

The Project Manager is prepared to participate in one-on-one sessions with potential prime contractors. Morning and afternoon periods are available on 2-4 August. Potential prime contractors have priority and may register on a first come - first serve basis with the Contracting Officer.

GLIB CONCEPT EXPLORATION DESIGN

As a result of recent market research and internal maturing of the acquisition strategy, the Coast Guard has now established a GLIB Concept Exploration Design Historical Information Library that contains documents delivered to the Coast Guard in support of our internal feasibility study of the GLIB technical requirements. These documents were previously available on the web site as the "Point Design" under a more general heading of Government Furnished Information.

These documents are now available to help understand:

- a. the evolution and history of the concept level design used to demonstrate technical feasibility of the requirements.
- b. the ability to develop a feasible design from a performance based specification.
- c. the relationship of the hull form and propulsors to the overall design requirements and performance.

The GLIB Concept Exploration Design Historical Library contains non-warranted information and is not intended to be a substitute for a thorough understanding of the solicitation requirements. Although, at its level of maturity, the design satisfied the Coast Guard that the technical requirements were feasible, the design is not in full compliance with all of the requirements. The Coast Guard has not attempted to de-conflict the concept exploration design information with all of the requirements and cautions users of the information to this fact. The Coast Guard does not have an extensive or detailed listing of elements of the concept exploration

design that either meet or don't meet the requirements and development of this type of listing is not consistent with the Coast Guard's present acquisition strategy.

4200.Draft
DTCG23-01-R-AGLMSA
16 June 2000

COMMENTS

Any and all comments are invited. We would appreciate specific comments you may have in the areas listed in Attachment 1. We do not intend to address any comments prior to the pre-solicitation conference. Offerors are also encouraged to bring comments to the conference, especially if they can be addressed in either a general forum or in one-on-one meetings. However, all written industry comments will be reviewed and, if appropriate, incorporated into the RFP. The cutoff date for written comments is 18 August 2000. The Coast Guard does not intend to formally respond to written comments. Written comments in the form of an e-mail attachment to the contracting officer at the below e-mail address is the preferred format. Please note that some of the specific areas requested for comment will not have necessary Draft RFP elements posted on the web site commensurate with the date of this letter. The Coast Guard intends on having all available documents posted prior to the pre-solicitation conference.

DISCLAIMER

The Request for Comment is provided for information only and is subject to change. Potential offerors are cautioned not to prepare proposals on the basis of the Draft RFP. Proposals submitted in response to the Draft RFP will be rejected.

Sincerely,

Carl E. McGill
Contracting Officer
U.S. Coast Guard
Email: CMcGill@comdt.uscg.mil

<http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-a/glib/>

Attachment 1: Specific areas of comment

Attachment 1

1. The Coast Guard will require contractors to utilize the hull form (Lines Plan) developed as part of its internal Concept Exploration Design as the starting point for the design at the "concept" level of design maturity. This hull form, utilizing azimuthing podded propulsors, has demonstrated satisfactory performance in ice-tank and open water testing. Contractors will be required to mature this hull form to meet all requirements and will be required to submit a Concept Design, Contract Design, and Detail Design as contract deliverables based on this hull form. Is this approach and the contractor's responsibility for maturing/finalizing the hull form through the design process and meeting all performance goals clearly communicated in Section C?
2. While the performance specification identifies the minimum acceptable requirements, the Coast Guard values increased vessel performance in certain areas. The following are performance goals that are above and beyond requirements. Recognizing the competing design requirements of a multi-purpose vessel, it is understood that all goals may not be achievable. It is the Coast Guard's desire to develop a balanced ship design capable of meeting all requirements and potentially as many goals as possible to enhance the overall mission performance of the vessel. Performance goals listed below are in priority order from the most to least important parameter.

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Threshold</u>	<u>Goal</u>
a. Design life (hull & superstructure)	30 yrs	40 yrs
b. Operational availability	90%	95%
c. Brash icebreaking capability ahead @ 3 knots	8 ft	12 ft
d. Draft, extreme (at delivery)	15.5 ft	15.0 ft
e. Speed, economical	10 kts	12 kts
f. Fuel range	15 days	21 days
g. Stopping distance	750 ft	500 ft
h. Track width	60 ft	75 ft
i. Buoy deck area	3000 sf	3500 sf

Please comment on which of these goals could reasonably be incentivized as part of the contract

structure?

3. Please comment on any unintended or potentially unnecessary cost drivers.
4. Please comment on any producibility concerns with the hull form as provided.
5. Please comment on the delivery schedule including design and construction times. Are the time frames reasonable/realistic?
6. Is the Share Ratio and Ceiling Price for the Ship Construction Fixed Price Incentive CLIN reasonable?
7. Is the requirement to design to an operational availability A_0 of 90% something industry is used to doing and has good experience with? Can industry provide traceability of A_0 to design of systems and equipment selection to meet requirements?
8. Are the follow-on maintenance requirements sufficiently defined for a firm fixed price CLIN?
9. The award will be made on the basis of best value to the government. The Coast Guard is also contemplating a combination of oral and technical proposals. Please provide comments on the proposal requirements in Sections L.